
REPLY

TO AN ATTACK FROM

EX-GOVERNOR SEYMOUR

UPON

GENERAL GARFIELD.

REPLY
TO
AN ATTACK FROM EX-GOVERNOR SEYMOUR
UPON
GENERAL GARFIELD.

To arraign the masses of a civilized people through a period of one hundred years were an idle and ungracious office. It is of the leaders of parties, under whatever name and at whatever time, it is warranted to speak freely and earnestly. So now I mean to speak.

The nature of our national structure was long since correctly defined as "a representative democracy," a government by the people through its chosen agents. This was its initiative form. When the rights of the democracy were assured, and its representation was distributed into executive, judicial, legislative departments, with defined duties and powers and rights, and its structure thus assumed in its consummated form as a republic, as such republic it was clothed with its national character. Hence it is that, as being of the masses, we are all Democrats; thus represented, we are all Republicans,—a Republican nation; in the early words of one of its founders, "one great body politic," deriving our origin from the conjoint act of the people of the United States in the Declaration of Independence,—and thus symbolized ere a year from the issue of that declaration, in a national flag, the expression of our union and of our unity. Look at that flag

as it floats from our steeples and is unfurled on our ships' masts, proclaiming upon the land and upon the sea these indissoluble facts. But, unhappily,—most unhappily for the peace and welfare of the people,—the great union with complete sovereignty ere long dwindled into an imperilling confederation. But, imperfect as was this confederation, it exerted the great powers of a nation in the allying treaty with France as a coadjutor, and in the treaty of peace with England as a solvent of all its colonial relations and the fulfilment of the Declaration of Independence. Great and decisive as were these great acts, the imperfections of the structure caused embarrassing perplexities, cherishing in colonial minds preferences of State power, alarming those minds with killing jealousies, and withholding from the people, as one political body, the rights, powers, and attributes of a nation of free-men. Washington, sage and modest, of "superlative fame," quoted by each party with reverence, but whose opinions, convictions, acts, all, all, are a living rebuke of the leaders of the Democratic party, declared, "Persuaded I am that the primary cause of all our disorders lies in the different State governments, and in the tenacity of that power which pervades their whole system." This great "body politic" was compelled to rest upon crutches, and these crutches were the failing supports of the States which on them leaned, halting cripples.

And now we have reached practically the first topic of these remarks. They bear upon a recent speech of Governor Seymour in the Utica Opera House, when it is stated, doubtless truly, that "he was received with the most affectionate greetings." For Horatio Seymour is a genial man, of most pleasant address, a graceful exhortator, very clever at an agricultural meeting, but in political life, both in theory and in practice, an utter failure.

History tells us that the Democratic party, of which he is regarded as an arch-priest, is a skilful player at the game of shuffle-board.

The supersedure of Jefferson by Madison, the earliest instance, the supersedure of Seymour by the clever man of barrels and of cyphers, and the recent suppression of Tilden by the hapless Hancock, all tell the same piteous tale,—the hapless General Hancock, now sadly exposed by General Grant as a tool of Andrew Johnson, used by him as an accomplice in a conspiracy by that false man, insulting to the hearts and minds of this nation, in order to gain an election to the

Presidency by defeating the great acts of Congress, passed to restore the supremacy of the whole nation and to relieve permanently the afflictions of the victims of their own treason. Hapless General Hancock ! Illustrious Grant ! whose fidelity to his country in every passing day is blazoned with the lights of his true greatness, his nerved, untiring patriotism.

Now let us turn to Governor Seymour as a vivid instance to another sort of fidelity,—fidelity to his party,—seeking to preserve or recover favor by harsh, unwarranted aspersions of the honored dead, and malignant vituperations of the Republican party, and of its brave, cultured candidate, presenting with unsurpassed ability his undisguised, instructive lessons upon the highest questions affecting the honor, the welfare, the lawful rights and duties, of the American people ; not forgetting his attitude, when speaking recently in the opera-house at Utica, but his attitude as the Governor of this State, with regard to it and to that of the United States, both of which he was sworn to support ; with regard to the preservation of the peace of that great city, New York ; and not only to its safety, but to that of the misguided foreign population, one thousand of whom became the victims of his unscrupulous ambition, when colored citizens were hung from the lamp-posts, private residences marked out by red crosses to be burned, only quelled in their riot by the clubs of a faithful police and the sad necessity of armed force ; not forgetting his attitude at the moment when a rebel army was advancing to the capture of our alarmed city, and to the capitulation of New York, only arrested in its devastations by the victory at Gettysburg, for whose brave part in which, of killing thousands of rebels, Hancock is now a Southern idol !

Seymour is a man of many words, nor did he hesitate to use them on the Fourth of July, 1863, the day of days in our history.

At the Academy of Music, ever a dramatic orator, surrounded by the chiefs of the Democratic party from different States, he addressed a vast multitude, chiefly of foreign birth, teeming with passion at the anticipated draft. He had urged Lincoln not to press it, and was answered by this Republican President with assurances of his authority : “ The volunteer system was already decreed by Congress, and palpably and probably, in fact, so far exhausted as to be inadequate ; ” that he could not defer it as to an enemy which “ drives every able-

bodied man into the ranks very much as a butcher drives bullocks into a slaughter-pen." Seymour, encouraged by the angry cheers, declared "the government of to-day has brought the country to the very verge of destruction;" denounced it as "hostile to their rights and liberties,—who would do them wrong as to their most sacred franchises;" and refers to the excitement as leading "to ripen into civil troubles that shall carry civil war into our homes." Is it peace "to be coerced"? "Can it be produced by seizing our persons, by infringing upon our rights, by insulting our homes, depriving us of those cherished principles for which our fathers fought, and to which we have already sworn allegiance?" "Do you not," he demanded of the Union men,—“do you not create revolution when you say that your persons may be rightfully seized, your property confiscated, your homes entered? Are you not exposing yourselves, your own interests, to as great a peril as that with which you threaten us? Remember that the bloody, treasonable, and revolutionary doctrine of public necessity can be proclaimed by a mob as well as by a government.” And, confiding in the success of the approaching rebel army, he added, "When men accept despotism, they may make a choice as to who the despot shall be. The struggle then will be, shall we have Constitutional liberty? But, having accepted the doctrine that the Constitution has lost its force, every instinct of personal ambition, every instinct of personal security, will lead men to put themselves under the protection of that power which they suppose most competent to guard their persons." To which power does he point if not to the hoped-for victor army of Robert Lee? Such was the rebel confidence that it was promulgated by a rebel ram in European waters that New York was in their possession. Can it be believed that men, now rebel senators, stood by in approving concert with this language of treason?

It was the assurance that

"Treason never prospers; what's the reason?
Why, when it prospers none dare call it treason."

This criminal inciter to inhuman violence, in words to excite popular alarm, in this his recent speech, not soon to be forgotten, and not readily to be forgiven, says:

"The points most conspicuous in the speeches and journals of the

Republican party are,—first, that this is a NATION, and next, this election is a contest between the Northern and Southern States, in which a victory will be a great gain to the former party. We charge that the denunciations of the South are used to mask their designs to get jurisdiction over all the Union, and mainly over the interests and people of the North, as they are the most important and varied; that the term ‘nation’ is selected because it is a word of obscure and indefinite meaning; and if it is substituted for the legal and proper title of government it will enable them to make changes in its character hurtful to the rights of the people, and disastrous to the prosperity of their business and industrial pursuits; that the mischiefs it will create will not be for the remote future, but they are pressing upon us now; and will be felt in their full force from this time on, unless they are averted by the results of the pending elections.

“It is a marked and conspicuous fact in the political discussions of the past four years that the Republican leaders have sought to bring into use the words nation and nationality when speaking of our country. These have been heretofore used without any special significance, as terms generally applied to different divisions of the human race into communities, governed by some forms of law. We always find that the men who use the word—and many, like Senator Blaine, love to call it a sovereign nation—are in favor of a different construction of the Constitution than has heretofore prevailed. Mr. Garfield openly states this, when he says that the views held by Mr. Hamilton are growing in strength, and he rejoices that our government is gravitating to more power. We find, too, that they favor the plans of the same distinguished statesman of gaining jurisdiction by constructions put upon the words of the Constitution. As they do not like, at this moment, to develop all their plans, which would excite alarm, particularly at the North, to mask their purposes and to divert attention by exciting passions and prejudices they use the word, as far as they can, in connection with sectional controversies, so that it may be felt they only have in view the strength of the Union. It is this idea which gives their phrases a measure of favor with the Republican party. They also take great pains in their discussions to carry the idea that nationality means something favorable to the interests of the North.”

Nor is he content with mere general assertions. He proceeds fur-

ther, and dares to use the name of Hamilton as a ground of objection : " Mr. Garfield openly states 'in favor of a different construction of the Constitution than has heretofore prevailed' when he says that the views held by Mr. Hamilton are growing in strength, and he rejoices that our government is gravitating to more power. We find, too, that they favor the plans of the same distinguished statesman of gaining jurisdiction by constructions put upon the words of the Constitution." This old, now-revived charge is neither more nor less, as to Hamilton, than a most unworthy, most disgraceful, deliberate, dastard calumny. His own declared opinion on the constitutionality of a national bank is a complete refutation of it, and admitted so to be in the subsequently declared views of the very men who made it, to accomplish their own local and selfish purposes.

Though Hamilton is known as of New York, he also belonged to our Philadelphia, the scene of the greatest periods of his life.

Who can listen without emotion to the narratives of the day when our Quaker population were seen gathered at his door in Market Street to congratulate him upon his victory over the attacks of Giles and Madison as to his conduct of the public loans; or the sobbing assemblage at Christ church mourning and weeping at his untimely fate? In furtherance of his purpose, Seymour makes General Garfield observe in his own words: "I am to be a senator from Ohio for six years. Hamilton was right when he said, 'Senators should hold for life.' I am glad that his opinions grow in favor. He did not like our Constitution, but said everything depended upon the way it was construed. This heavy volume on my table, called the 'Civil List,' knows the names of more than seventy thousand men paid from the treasury. This does not include the soldiers and sailors. I am glad to see we are gravitating to more power," etc.

Can anything be more atrocious than this? He attributes language to General Garfield, and puts it in quotation marks, as though he meant the public to believe that he had used the words he quotes. I assert and challenge contradiction, in the most unqualified, direct assertion, that General Garfield neither used the words nor expressed the ideas thus attributed to him. I aver that Governor Seymour is guilty of a gross breach of honor in claiming that General Garfield ever favored the election of senators for life, or any such thing. He has

no ground for the allegation, except, because, in addressing the people of New York, he paid a generous tribute to Alexander Hamilton, and in his letter of acceptance affirmed the nationality of the general government.

The pretended quotation is spurious, and I challenge him to find any such or similar passage in any speech of this shamefully traduced statesman.

This unscrupulous commentator has forgotten to quote the language of Madison, urging that the proposed government be so constituted "as to protect the majority of the opulent against the minority. The Senate ought to be this body, and, to answer this purpose, ought to have permanency and stability. Various have been the propositions, but my opinion is the longer they continue in office the better will this view be answered."

"The government should have a negative in all cases whatsoever on the legislative acts of the States, as the King of Great Britain had." This, "I conceive," said Madison, "to be essential, and the least possible abridgment of the State sovereignties,—the right of *coercion*,—should be expressly declared." This right a more out-and-out Democratic President, the leader of the Democratic party, asserted was an existing power of the Confederacy, to be enforced by a single blockading frigate!

To make such a constitutional provision, Hamilton declared, would be "to enact a civil war." "The fabric of the American empire," he said, "ought to rest on the solid basis of the consent of the people. The streams of national power ought to flow immediately from that pure original fountain of all legitimate authority." "The majesty of the national authority must be manifested through the medium of the courts of justice." Such were his views, but Seymour not only imputes individual ill purposes in the use of the word "nation," but, as has been seen, goes further, and charges upon the Republican party *designs* inimical to the Constitution in the use of this comprehensive term.

And now, I would ask, with an assured confidence in the hearts and heads of the American people; if we are not a Nation, what are we? Are we tribes of men and women with no fixed homes or hearts? Are we tell-tale pilgrims, or classes with no general or overruling, sustaining, sustained rights or powers: seditious, factious Arabs in the deserts

of a vast unrepresented Democracy, or seditious factions, a riotous rabble? Must we see again our rivers, now teeming with the wealth of Western industry, floated only with licensed State crafts; our great inland seas, our lakes, mere scenes of unfriendly, hostile conflicts; our coasting trade limited to petty fishing-smacks; our harbors ports of piracy; Virginia and Maryland suing and bargaining for the conjoint uses of an intervening bay; the almost starving people of proud, active New England wantoning in inflammatory collisions and contests, with an army of the United States of only eighty men to suppress them! My countrymen, my friends, this is not a mere fancy picture. The history of our country during the war of the Revolution, but mostly subsequent to it, until the adoption of our National Constitution, is little else than the narrative of negative State governments held, hardly held, together by a twining thread, a thread of discord. Far different, widely different, is our grand situation. Though a government with a mixed Constitution in the structure, it is true, but in the operation of its powers at home national, and under international law recognized among the family of nations, we are a nation not merely of powers, but of great rights and duties. As to its power, ere a generation had ended from the adoption of the Constitution, our frigates, the "Constitution," the "Constellation," the "~~Guerriere~~," were shaking the nerves of the British House of Commons. If the names of Decatur and Hull and Bainbridge were ever in our youthful ears, is not that of the modest Farragut, with his gallant sailors, associated with unsurpassed triumphs of skill and dauntless courage? Was not our army *national* when, under Washington, it confronted and reduced into subjection the Democratic insurgents in the Whiskey Insurrection in Pennsylvania? And were not our armies *national* when, called out under an express power of the "National" Constitution by Lincoln, they confronted and subdued the widely-extended, obstinately-maintained treason of the "solid South"? And are not the names of Andrew Jackson, the hater of Southern secession; and of Ulysses Grant, and of Sherman and Sheridan, as types of American courage, and of American glory, and, above all, of American love of the nation, sacred to us all, with their brave armies, regular and volunteer,—sacred as the defenders of the Union and free government, of re-established national rights, and reintegrated, partly reintegrated, as to the rights of violated

"*United
State*"

humanity? These are the armed arguments of our nationality. Others at home are not absent. A distinguished, most proficient, far-looking statesman, pointing to the map of the United States, asks whence and how the increase of our domain, possessed by the separate States, of five hundred millions of acres to two billions and over, acquired by the nation by cession, conquest, or treaty, this quadruple augmentation, was obtained? Was it by the nation or by the States? and he assures us truly, eloquently, not an acre, not an inch, was ever acquired by a single State. The entire mass was the acquisition of this our nation. The title is in the nation, bestowable only at its will.

What power decides its sovereignty, declaring who, and when, and how the incoming subjects of other nations may be admitted into a share of that coveted sovereignty? Is it not that of naturalization, the expression of our nation's power in a nation's laws?

A great Democratic leader once claimed that as a State right; but ere he died he abandoned this idle solecism. To whom can the legalized foreign citizen appeal for protection from foreign wrong but to this nation?

Allusion has been made to the plenary power of treaty. Allusion has been made to the power of enlarging our domain. Allusion has just been made to the self-creating power of naturalization; but now read the preamble to the Constitution, and see there how vast its other beneficial purposes and objects, how equivalently extensive its high authority: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure Domestic Tranquillity, provide for the Common Defence, promote the General Welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this CONSTITUTION for the United States of America."

Here do we not behold in this great mirror of our history these purposes to constitute a nation with attributes intended to be "adequate to the exigencies of the Union" and to the unity of a nation?

Next let us turn to that history in its many teachings. It must be remembered that the first official movement to provide a remedy for disunion was a motion in the Senate of New York in 1782 for a committee "to take into consideration the state of the NATION," followed the next day by the pregnant resolution calling for a General Conven-

tion to revise and amend the Confederation,—the Genesis of our national existence. Year after year this only effective remedy for multiplied and multiplying evils was urged and again urged, until at last the convention met at Philadelphia to frame a constitution. Mark! The first proposition in that convention, over which Washington presided, was a proposition, offered by the governor of Virginia, for the creation of a NATIONAL Legislature, amended by a resolution from New York, “that the rights of suffrage in the National Legislature ought to be proportioned to the number of Free Inhabitants.”

So the same spirit we find in the great commentary to induce the adoption of the Constitution. Read it and digest it. The language is, “An exclusive power of the regulating elections for the *National* Government;” “the organization as a *National* Government;” “*National* councils;” “*National* character;” “a National inquest;” “National courts;” and at its solemn close, the warning appeal as to “a NATION without a NATIONAL Government.” Such was the language in this lauded commentary as addressed to the American people, and by the adopting acts in the several State Conventions recognized by them. We advance again to the language of the Constitution, and next to its ruling, commanding, mandatory provision:

“This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the SUPREME LAW of the land, and the judges in *every* State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.” Who can ordain and establish “a Supreme Law,” not only over individuals, but over single or confederate States, other than the people of the United States, consummating by their own great act the declared power of a Supreme Law? a nation asserting itself without any lawful power of contradiction? Another inquiry is, How was this Constitution in its large operations regarded by the high magistrate sworn “to preserve, protect, and defend” it,—the great oath or affirmation enforced by it, to be recorded in the chancery of the Almighty?

In his Inaugural Address to the first Congress he refers to “the foundation of our NATIONAL policy,”—“the smiles of Heaven can never be extended to a NATION that disregards the eternal rules of

order and right." In his reply to the Senate he speaks of our "infant NATION." In his first subsequent speech he adverts "to our intercourse with *other* nations," and urges "the institution of a National University." In his next speech he rejoices in "the increasing reputation and credit of the nation." Again, he calls attention to the obligations "of the law of nations." When pressing a provision for the national debt, he says, "Nothing can more promote the welfare of the nation." Following this, he points to "the expediency of establishing a National University;" next he adverts to "a cordial harmony with *other* nations, in conformity with that of our nation;" and, lastly, of his only two proclamations,—one inveighing against the Whiskey Insurrection in Pennsylvania, alludes to the powers vested in "the marshals appointed under a law of the Union;" and the other is for a thanksgiving "to the Great Ruler of nations for the manifold and signal mercies which distinguish our lot *as a nation*," among which mercies enumerated was "the suppression of the late insurrection." How far these several documents were from another's pen is not the question: they were those of Washington under his great chief responsibility to the public welfare of an infant NATION rising to its manhood in the exercise of great national duties.

What next, it may properly be asked, was the conduct of the LEADERS of the Democratic party, signaling their opposition to the Constitution by elevating to the Vice-Presidency its chief opponent? They opposed the funding-system created to pay the debts of the Revolution, "the price of liberty." They opposed an auxiliary to it in the creation of a national bank, but admitted subsequently by its opponents as an opposition not to its constitutionality, or to its expediency, but from other extraneous motives. They trifled with the measures urged to provide a national currency, and then proposed *to tax* the public securities; they opposed a ratification of the treaty with Great Britain, which preserved our peace during several valuable years of our youth as a nation, and then promulgated the doctrines of 1798, the favorite argument for the great rebellion of their political followers. Is it wonderful that, after such successive acts, Washington, in his own draft of a Farewell Address, should have *denounced* Jefferson and Madison as "the characters who are now strongest and foremost in the opposition to the government," and should have

written to his beloved La Fayette, "that a party exists in the United States, by a combination of circumstances, which oppose the government in all its measures, and are determined, as all their conduct evinces, by clogging its wheels indirectly, to change the nature of it and to subvert the Constitution"?

But we must not stop here. Again I ask, read the Eighth Article of the Constitution, conferring the powers of Congress in their order. The foremost of these is its money-power, with the prohibition in respect to it. It is a power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States," with the precaution they should be "uniform;" and following this ample provision is the authority "to borrow money on the credit of the United States," and "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin."

Next read the restriction that "No State 'shall' coin money, emit bills of credit, make anything but gold and silver coin a *tender* in payment of debts." Whence this prohibition? Virginia had authorized the issue of "legal tenders," copied by North Carolina and by Georgia and by Rhode Island. The Congress of the Confederation, without power to provide any means for their redemption, declared that their bills should *not* be a *legal tender* in any other manner than their *current value, compared with gold and silver.*" How does the Republican party stand here? A Republican Congress provided, in the Resumption Act, that the Secretary of the Treasury, after the 1st of January, 1879, "shall redeem in *coin* the United States *legal-tender* notes then outstanding, on their presentation for redemption at the office of the Assistant Treasurer of the United States in the city of New York, in sums not less than fifty dollars." This act is a direct pledge not to be violated without a violation of the Constitution, declaring that "the validity of the public DEBT of the United States authorized by law shall never be violated." The repeal of this act would be an open act of repudiation, unless provision were otherwise made for such redemption or for payment by an honest equivalent to the money in which the debt was originated. General Hayes, in his letter of acceptance to the nomination for the Presidency, met this great obligation, declaring, in the same honest spirit previously manifested by General Grant, "I regard all the laws of the United States relating

to the payment of the public indebtedness, the *legal-tender* notes included, as constituting a pledge and moral obligation of the government, which must in good faith be kept." Golden words of this excellent, firm, faithful patriot! Compare with these the previous words of Horatio Seymour, when also a candidate for the Presidency, in a letter dated the 24th of July, 1868: "PUSH THE DEBT AND TAXATION UPON PUBLIC ATTENTION!"

Passing from such an iniquity to a special consideration of the present public interest, it may not be amiss to consider what was the *coin* in which the debt was contracted? Was it not in gold of the then existing standard, or in silver of the then value of gold? A Democratic Congress has not so regarded it. As yet, because of the Republican President unable to repeal the Resumption Act, it authorizes a silver currency for the public uses, a depreciated currency, at this very moment holding a deceptive language as to "the dollars of the fathers."

Were not, again I ask, the coins to be of equivalent value in an honest bi-metalism?

When bi-metalism has heretofore been established in Europe and in this country, the legislation has always endeavored to make the market value of the silver issued, of the legal value of both gold and silver coins, modifying the legal value at long intervals according to the market or bullion value of each metal. This principle of value, avowed by the first Secretary of the Treasury, was carefully observed in the legislation that followed; and so it has been observed, until a Democratic Congress in the Silver bill of 1878, the first time in the history of coinage, openly and wilfully made the legal value of silver greater than the market value, thus attempting to give a fiat value in the payment of debts. How rapidly will the issue of this depreciated currency tell injuriously? is a serious question. At the present rate of issue, if continued, in all probability within two years, is the nearest answer that can be given. The injurious effect upon the community has been a frequent topic. Payment of the public obligations in such a currency has been freely denounced as "cheating,"—cheating those who lent their good money to the extent of the depreciation,—and its issue as "enabling every other debtor to do the same."

One effect is obviously certain: the lower the value of the currency

the higher the price to the consumer, public and private, of all that is purchased. And by this reduction of standard the losers are not chiefly the wealthy, the shrewd, the busy, but the poor, the uninformed, the unsuspecting, industrious of the people.

Listen to General Garfield on the Greenback question :

"In the name of every man who wants his own when he has earned it, I DEMAND that we do not make the wages of the poor man shrivel in his hands when he has earned them, but that his money shall be better and better, until the ploughholder's money shall be as good as the bondholder's money, until our standard is one, and there is no longer one money for the rich and another for the poor." History has recorded the facts and its verdicts as to the issue of an unequalized, unsecured currency. The Continental money of the Confederation, in round terms, amounted to two hundred millions of dollars, and the assignats of France to nine thousand millions, issued within five years, from 1792 to 1796 ! Where now are the wild-cat issues of most of the State banks, secured by nothing ? Are the people of the United States prepared for similar enjoyments ? Yet the language, and to a certain extent the temper, of the solid South is twofold. Tax the public securities, and pay them in a depreciated currency ; repeal the tax on the State banks, and thus repeal the national banks out of existence.

In June, 1879, as stated by the controller of the currency in his report of December, 1879, there were two thousand and forty-eight national banks, with a capital of four hundred and fifty-five millions, and holding deposits to the amount of seven hundred and thirteen millions, with a circulation of three hundred and thirteen millions. Repeal the charters of these two thousand banks, we will then be a nation without a national currency. Let those who desire a picture full in its general features and minute in its details read the speeches of General Garfield of March, 1866, and of April, 1874, especially upon an act "To amend the several acts providing a national currency," and then deny the truth of the final comment, "If this legislation prevails, the day is not far distant when the cry will come up from those who labor in humblest fields of industry denouncing those who have let loose upon them the evils enveloped in this bill ;" and let them read the statements of the several votes in favor of the substitution of

tender paper money, in the support of which there was but one Republican vote, and, remembering the fact that the Resumption Act did not receive a single Democratic vote in either House of Congress, see the state of parties on a bill as late as Feb. 22, 1879, to repeal that act, when, on the motion of General Garfield to lay it on the table,—in fact, to merge it,—every Republican vote but five was in favor of this motion; and of the Democratic members, all but twenty-seven were against it. It is idle to talk of what the Democrats may or will do as to honest money, when we know in their Silver bill what *they have done*. Of these one hundred and five Democratic votes, how many were from the South?

One more topic in this connection remains of principal and touching moment, the effect of the disturbance of values upon the people's banks,—the "Savings-Banks."

In these institutions of economy and prudence, the number of depositors in 1879 exceeded two millions and a quarter; and the amount of the deposits exceeded eight hundred millions, the average to each depositor being three hundred and fifty-three dollars. These humble sums ought to be as sacred as the votive offerings at consecrated shrines. Ought the decrepid, the widows, the orphans, to be despoiled of the fruits of their industry, and their provision against disease and age, merely to satisfy the theoretic madness of rash Greenback inflators, or of Southern traitors, whose covetous ambition disregards the prudence of care and the pride of integrity? The chief office of Christianity is to teach the gospel to the poor. Is it not the duty of the immediate servants of God to implore His care for the welfare of the poor to whom they are thereby enjoined to preach? Let them on their bended knees think of this. We want not honeyed words, but deprecating adjurations. I urge this duty, having seen gathered in the public streets, around the closed doors of doubted savings-banks, crowds of trembling, impoverished beings, waiting their apprehended fate because of unsafe, unworthy trustees. What are these weeping alarms compared with the well-founded solitudes of the many good and wise, as to the wrongs of infuriated politicians, hating us for our triumphs, bent upon revenge, and upon the invasion of our rights, our liberties, our properties, as members of one great indissoluble nation?

VINDEX.

